

MBL/Woods Hole  
August 23, 1954

Dear Bernie:

*Copy  
8/16/54*

I am as sensitive as you to the amount of time we spent on this letter to the Times, but am sure you are joking in suggesting this as a consideration. I am ~~rather~~ troubled by the news from Harry Eagle, and think we must consider very carefully whether to disregard his own expressed wish that we let the matter drop. If we pursue the matter at all, I think we have to take more account of the fact that Plumb did ask for an interview, which Harry refused, than merely to delete that fifth paragraph. To my mind this was the only constructive thing we had hoped to accomplish. I do not mean that Plumb can be wholly absolved, but I think it would not be wholly honest to omit this part of the story from the account. Our complaint might then appear rather weak. This is not necessarily unfortunate, for we would then be in the position of commenting, without blaming anyone, on the miscommunication between the scientist and the reporter. But the whole letter would have to be recast: would you want to take the time?

The letter has a good deal more to it than the reprimand to the reporter, but most of this discussion was, I think, of particular interest to yourself. You may very well want to pursue it, and hope you will not hesitate to do so over your own signature.

A third alternative would be to return to the original scheme of writing directly to Mr. Plumb, adding the comment that he still has to take responsibility for his own writing, whether he succeeded in getting the interview or not. One wonders if the tone of the

*Let me know what you think. I don't think I can go along with article did not originate, in part, from his pique. You on the present is in the same manner. Yours, Jack.*